



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,236	03/06/2007	Furong Zhu	34018-1040	8256
45263 7590 12/19/2008 MITCHELL P. BROOK LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS LLP 11988 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 200 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130				
EXAMINER				
HINES, ANNE M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2879				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/583,236

Applicant(s)

ZHU ET AL.

Examiner

ANNE M. HINES

Art Unit

2879

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, 23-25, 27, 28 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, 23-25, 27, 28 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/08 & 6/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 8, 2008 has been entered.

Claims 1-19, 21, 23-25, 27-28, and 30 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 9, 11, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winans et al. (US 2002/0173354) (of record) in view of Grace et al. (US 6856086).

Regarding claim 1, Winans teaches a flexible organic light emitting device comprising a flexible substrate (Fig. 7, 451; Page 12, Paragraph [0119]), a lower electrode layer the flexible substrate (Fig. 7, 452; Page 12, Paragraph [0117]), an upper electrode layer that is at least semi-transparent (Fig. 7, 454; Page 12, Paragraph [0117]; Page 12, Paragraph [0120]), an organic region between the lower electrode layer and

the upper electrode layer, in which electroluminescence can take place when a voltage is applied between the lower electrode and the upper electrode (Fig. 7, 453; Page 12, Paragraph [0116]), wherein the flexible substrate is comprised of either a metal foil or a plastic film (Page 12, Paragraph [0119]), and wherein when a metal foil is used, the substrate is disposed such that light generated as a result of the electroluminescence directed towards the metal foil is reflected back to the at least semi-transparent upper electrode layer for enhancing light output from the flexible organic light emitting device (Page 12, Paragraph [0119]). Winans fails to teach wherein the substrate comprises both an upper substrate layer comprised of a plastic, a polymer, or a dielectric and a lower metal substrate layer and the lower electrode is formed on the upper substrate layer.

In the same field of endeavor, Grace teaches wherein a flexible composite substrate layer includes both an upper substrate layer of a polymer laminated with a lower reflective metal substrate layer (Fig. 1, 32 & 40; Column 4, lines 15-34; Column 7, lines 3-11) in order to provide a substrate with a moisture and oxygen barrier and structural stability (Column 7, lines 3-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Winans to have the flexible substrate be the flexible substrate of Grace including both an upper substrate layer of a polymer laminated with a lower reflective metal substrate layer in order to provide a substrate with a moisture and oxygen barrier and structural stability, as disclosed by Grace.

Regarding claim 9, Winans further discloses wherein the upper electrode layer is transparent (Page 12, Paragraph [0120]).

Regarding claim 11, Winans further discloses wherein the upper electrode layer is a semitransparent or transparent cathode (Page 12, Paragraph [0120]).

Regarding claim 28, Winans further discloses wherein the organic region comprises a hole transporting layer and an emissive layer or an electron transporting layer (Page 12, Paragraph [0116]).

Regarding claim 30, Winans further discloses wherein the organic region comprises a hole transporting layer, an emissive layer, and an electron transporting layer (Page 12, Paragraph [0116]).

Claims 1, 2-8, 12-13, 15 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima (US 2003/0178937) (of record) in view of Grace et al. (US 6856086).

Regarding claim 1, Mishima teaches a flexible organic light emitting device comprising a flexible substrate (Page 2, Paragraph [0023]), a lower electrode layer the flexible substrate (Page 3, Paragraph [0034]), an upper electrode layer that is at least semi-transparent (Page 5, Paragraph [0066]), an organic region between the lower electrode layer and the upper electrode layer, in which electroluminescence can take place when a voltage is applied between the lower electrode and the upper electrode (Page 3, Paragraphs [0039]-[0044]), wherein the flexible substrate is comprised of an upper substrate layer of a polymer layer laminated to a lower substrate layer comprised

of a metal foil (Page 2, Paragraphs [0023]-[0024]). Mishima fails to teach wherein the metal foil is reflective such that light generated as a result of the electroluminescence directed towards the metal foil is reflected back to the at least semi-transparent upper electrode for enhancing light output from the flexible organic light emitting device.

In the same field of endeavor, Grace teaches wherein a flexible composite substrate layer includes both an upper substrate layer of a polymer laminated with a lower reflective metal foil substrate layer (Fig. 1, 32 & 40; Column 4, lines 15-34; Column 7, lines 3-11) in order to provide a substrate with a moisture and oxygen barrier and structural stability as well as reflect light back toward the top of the device through the upper substrate layer (Column 7, lines 3-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Winans to have the flexible substrate be the flexible substrate of Grace including both an upper substrate layer of a polymer laminated with a lower reflective metal substrate layer in order to provide a substrate with a moisture and oxygen barrier and structural stability as well as reflect light back toward the top of the device through the upper substrate layer, as disclosed by Grace.

Regarding claim 2, Mishima further discloses wherein at least one of the upper and lower electrodes has an interfacial modified surface for enhancing charge carrier injection (Page 3, Paragraph [0033]).

Regarding claim 3, Mishima further discloses wherein the at least one of the upper or lower electrodes comprises a metal electrode, and wherein the interfacial

surface is modified using inorganic or organic materials or a transparent conductive oxide (Page 3, Paragraph [0033]).

Regarding claim 4, Mishima further discloses wherein the flexible substrate is comprised of a plastic layer laminated to or coated with an aluminum layer, the plastic layer being positioned between the lower electrode and the aluminum layer (Page 2, Paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claim 5, Mishima further discloses wherein the flexible substrate is comprised of a steel foil (Page 2, Paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claim 6, Mishima further discloses wherein the device further comprises an isolation layer between the flexible substrate and the lower electrode layer (Page 2, Paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claim 7, Mishima further discloses wherein the isolation layer is a spin-coated polymeric layer or a dielectric layer (Page 2, Paragraph [0024]).

Regarding claim 8, Mishima further discloses an isolation layer between the steel foil and the lower electrode (Page 2, Paragraph [0023]).

Regarding claim 12, Mishima further discloses wherein the upper electrode layer is a multilayer structure comprising at least one semitransparent or transparent conductive film (Page 5, Paragraph [0067]).

Regarding claim 13, Mishima further discloses wherein the multilayer structure comprises an index-matching layer of a material having an index of refraction index chosen such that the light output is further enhanced, and a charge carrier injection layer (Page 5, Paragraph [0067]; Page 7, Paragraph [0086]). Note that the Examiner

considers the phrase 'chosen such that the light output is further enhanced' to be a claim to a product by process; in a claim to a device it is the claimed structure and not the process which is given patentable weight, in this instance Mishima's disclosed structure of an aluminum layer with an ITO layer formed on it characteristically meets the required structure of a charge injection layer with an index-matching layer.

Regarding claim 15, Mishima further discloses wherein the index-matching layer comprises an inorganic material having a refractive index effective for enhancing light output (Page 7, Paragraph [0086]).

Regarding claim 23, Mishima further discloses wherein the multilayer structure is a cathode and the charge carrier injection layer is an electron injection layer (Page 5, Paragraph [0067]; Page 7, Paragraph [0086]).

Regarding claim 24, Mishima further discloses wherein the electron injection layer comprises a low work function metal (Page 5, Paragraph [0067]; Page 7, Paragraph [0086]).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winans et al. (US 2002/0173354) (of record) and Grace et al. (US 6856086) in view of Silvernail et al. (US 6597111) (of record).

Regarding claim 10, Winans and Grace teach the invention of claim 1, including wherein both the anode and cathode are multi-layer are transparent layers (Page 12, Paragraphs [0117]-[0120]), but fails to teach wherein light from the top-emitting device is emitted through the anode.

In the same field of endeavor, Silvernail teaches wherein an OLED is provided with either the anode or cathode as the top light emitting electrode, thus exemplifying recognized equivalent structures of the OLED in the art (Figs. 1A-1B; Column 1, line 52 to Column 2, line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the top light emitting electrode of Winan and Grace as the anode instead of as the cathode, since the selection of any of these known equivalents would be considered within the level of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Silvernail's teaching.

Claims 14 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima (US 2003/0178937) (of record) and Grace et al. (US 6856086) in view of Tyan et al. (US 2004/0149984) (of record).

Regarding claim 14, Mishima and Grace teach the invention of claim 13, but fail to teach wherein the index-matching layer comprises an organic material having a refractive index for enhancing light output.

In the same field of endeavor, Tyan teaches a top-emitting OLED with a cathode including an electron injection layer of Li and Ag and an organic index-matching layer of Alq3 as an absorption reduction layer (Page 11, Paragraphs [0109]-[0115]) with a high refractive index in order to improve the luminance of the device (Page 3, Paragraph [0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Mishima and Grace to have the multi-layer cathode have a high refractive index absorption reduction layer of Alq3 in order to improve the luminance of the device, as disclosed by Tyan.

Regarding claim 25, Mishima and Grace teach the invention of claim 13, including wherein the electron injection layer is a rare earth metal (Mishima Page 5, Paragraph [0067]), but fail to teach wherein the index-matching layer comprises Alq3 or NPB.

In the same field of endeavor, Tyan teaches a top-emitting OLED with a cathode including an electron injection layer of Li and Ag and an organic index-matching layer of Alq3 as an absorption reduction layer (Page 11, Paragraphs [0109]-[0115]) with a high refractive index in order to improve the luminance of the device (Page 3, Paragraph [0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Mishima and Grace to have the multi-layer cathode have a high refractive index absorption reduction layer of Alq3 in order to improve the luminance of the device, as disclosed by Tyan.

Claims 16-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima (US 2003/0178937) (of record) and Grace et al. (US 6856086) in view of Silvernail et al. (US 6597111) (of record).

Regarding claim 16, Mishima and Grace teach the invention of claim 13, including wherein both the anode and cathode are multi-layer structures including charge injection layers and transparent ITO layers (Mishima Page 3, Paragraph [0033]; Page 5, Paragraph [0067]), but fail to teach wherein light from the top-emitting device is emitted through the anode.

In the same field of endeavor, Silvernail teaches wherein an OLED is provided with either the anode or cathode as the top light emitting electrode, thus exemplifying recognized equivalent structures of the OLED in the art (Figs. 1A-1B; Column 1, line 52 to Column 2, line 10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the top light emitting electrode of Mishima and Grace as the anode instead of as the cathode, since the selection of any of these known equivalents would be considered within the level of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by Silvernail's teaching.

Regarding claim 17, Mishima further discloses wherein the hole injection layer comprises a high work function metal or a transparent conductive oxide (Page 3, Paragraph [0033]).

Regarding claim 18, Mishima further discloses wherein the high work function metal is gold or silver (Page 3, Paragraph [0033]).

Regarding claim 19, Mishima further discloses wherein the transparent conductive oxide is ITO (Page 3, Paragraph [0033]).

Regarding claim 21, Mishima further discloses wherein the hole injection layer comprises an organic material, an inorganic material, or a combination of inorganic and organic materials that are effective for hole injection (Page 3, Paragraph [0033]).

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima (US 2003/0178937) (of record) and Grace et al. (US 6856086) in view of Lee et al. (US 2003/0234608) (of record).

Regarding claim 27, Mishima and Grace teach the invention of claim 23, and wherein the cathode is a two layer structure comprising an electron injection layer of Ca and a second layer of Ag (Mishima Page 5, Paragraph [0067]; Page 6, Paragraph [0070]; Page 3, Paragraph [0033]), but fail to teach wherein the cathode comprises a lithium fluoride layer under the Ca layer.

In the same field of endeavor, Lee teaches wherein the electron injection layer for an OLED is a Ca/LiF laminate with the LiF layer adjacent the organic layers of the organic device in order to provide an electron injection layer that keeps the driving voltage of the device low (Pages 4-5, Paragraphs [0057]-[0058]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Mishima and Grace to have the electron injection layer be the Ca/LiF laminate of Lee with the LiF layer closer to the organic layers of the device in order to provide an electron injection layer that keeps the driving voltage of the device low, as disclosed by Lee.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne M. Hines whose telephone number is (571) 272-2285. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Anne M Hines/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2879

/NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2879